

Sustainable Land Development Code, Public Review Draft

El Norte Informational Open House

Pojoaque Satellite Office Meeting Summary
September 13, 2012

Duration: 4:00 – 8:00 pm

Present:

County Staff:

Robert Griego, Planning Manager

Vicki Lucero, Building & Development Director

Sarah Ijadi, Senior Planner

Kristine Mihelcic, Media Production Public Relations Specialist

Penny Ellis-Green, Assistant County Manager

Juan Rios, Constituent Services Liaison

Community Members

6 participants.

Meeting summary compiled from staff notes pertaining to one-on-one conversations and flip charts used during the presentation/ Q&A period.

General overview

4:00- 4:45 one-on-one discussion among staff and community members.

4:45-6:00 overview presentation of SLDC with facilitated question and answers.

6:00-7:30 one-on-one discussions with individuals.

Meeting concluded at 7:45.

Key Issues

A. Cost of Environmental Impact Report

General discussion on anticipated cost of an EIR and type of applications requiring an EIR. Staff did not have sufficient information to address costs but assumes it will increase costs of application for certain development types.

Participants' Recommended Actions: Understanding and communicating the costs of a EIR by application type will be helpful for developers.

B. Assumption for the Water Services Availability Report (WSAR) may not be appropriate in rural areas.

The allowance for projects under 10,000 square feet to not generate a WSAR could be a loop hole in Rural areas because many MDWA or Community water systems can't serve even developments that are less than 10,000 square feet. Not requiring a WSAR may results in developments being permitted without a sustainable water supply.

Participants' Recommended Actions: Review Table 6-1 and WSAR text and compare with table 7-17 & 7-18. Communicate the relationship and scenario for areas with community water systems that don't have the capacity to serve.

C. The Agricultural/Ranch zoning district does not accommodate typical Northern County ag /ranch land uses which is conducted on smaller lots.

General discussion on how the code does not accommodate, support, reflect or incent preservation of historic development patterns of the north county.

Participants' Recommended Actions: Review zoning districts and general design standards of chapter 7 in light of the historic patterns.

D. Requirement for multi –family developments to connect with utility even remote areas.

General discussion on whether this is fair. Maybe reasonable to require connection for multi-family developments in order to protect general health and safety.

E. Does the code have an impact fee schedule?

General discussion that the code does not have a impact fee schedule but contains the framework. There should be an impact fee schedule so developers understand those costs before application. Will it be by residential units?

F. Will connection to sewer be required as per table 7.17?

General discussion that at least in Pojoaque Valley there is a need for a water treatment plant but doesn't currently exist. Table 7.17 is not clear.

G. Is the “Water Service Area” on the “official map”? If so does it include sewer?

- H. When will the code be completed? In 2-3 years?**
- I. Open space requirements in Chapter 7 and chapter 12 are not clear- will new development required to do both?**
- J. Discussion on current regulations pertaining to terrain management and build/no build areas established at time of subdivision.** New code only requires “no build” area be delineated.
- K. Discussion on impact that new assigned zoning will have on taxes-** Does the County Assessor’s office include zoning designation as factor in their valuation of property? How will this impact property owners?